

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-17 are all the claims pending in the application. Claim 1 is the only independent claim.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed prior art in view of Naito et al. (US 5,656,307).

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed prior art taken together with Naito and further in view of Wiedemann et al. (US 6,866,808).

Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed prior art taken together with Naito and further in view of Goldbach (US 6,780,365).

**Claims 1, 6, and 11**

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claims 1, 6, and 11 at least because the apparatus for molding components of a vehicular headlamp of claim 1, the mold device for molding components of a vehicular headlamp of claim 6, and the method of injecting molding components of a vehicular headlamp of claim 11 would not have been obvious in view of the Applicant's disclosed prior art and Naito. For example, the apparatus for molding components, mold device, or vehicular headlamp in which said first resin component is an extension reflector for a headlamp, and the second resin component is another portion of the headlamp, but is smaller than an open portion of the extension reflector would not have been obvious.

Naito teaches molding a cabinet assembly with an enclosure 1 in which, through the use of a runner 18 extending inwardly of the enclosure 1, accessories such as a panel 15, cover 16, and grill 17 are molded.<sup>1</sup>

The Examiner states that Naito discloses a molding of accessory components in a cavity with the larger component around the smaller component so as to produce the components at the same time and to reduce the number of molds for producing the components. Moreover, the Examiner states that when one is looking to improve the injection molding of vehicular headlamps, a person would look to the art of injection molding, and not just injection molding of vehicular headlamps. Therefore, the person in the art of injection mold manufacturing would have been the person of skill in the art.

Applicant reiterates that a person of ordinary skill would not have looked to Naito, which deals with cabinet assembly forming techniques, to solve the problems addressed by the instant inventors in the field of vehicular lamp assemblies. Instead, one of ordinary skill would have looked within the field of vehicular lamp assemblies. There is no teaching or suggestion regarding providing a second resin component that is sufficiently smaller than said first resin component that said second mold cavity fits within said first mold cavity in said mold, in which the first resin component is an extension reflector for a headlamp, and the second resin component is another portion of the headlamp, but is smaller than an open portion of the extension reflector.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Naito at FIGS. 1 & 5.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1, 6, and 11.

Claims 2-4, 7-9, and 17

With respect to dependent claims 2-4, 7-9, and 17, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection at least because of these claims dependency from claim 1, claim 6, or claim 11.

Claims 12 and 13

With respect to dependent claims 12 and 13, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection at least because of these claims dependency from claim 11 and because Wiedemann, which the Examiner asserts as showing resin passing from a first cavity to a second cavity, does not cure the deficiencies in the combination of Applicant's disclosed prior art and Naito discussed above.

Claims 14-16

With respect to dependent claims 14-16, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection at least because of these claims dependency from claim 11 and because Goldabach, which the Examiner asserts as showing the injection of a first resin and a second resin into respective mold cavities via separate supply passages, does not cure the deficiencies in the combination of Applicant's disclosed prior art and Naito discussed above.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
Application No.: 10/772,428

Attorney Docket No.: Q79493

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/John M. Bird/

---

John M. Bird  
Registration No. 46,027

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 21, 2007